

was alleged for the reason that the product was an imitation of butter and was offered for sale and was sold under the distinctive name of another article of food.

On January 2, 1914, the defendant Brockway entered a plea of guilty to the information on behalf of the firm, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1914.*

3261. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. George D. Lefas. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 210-c.)

On January 2, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Health Officer of said District, authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against George D. Lefas, Washington, D. C., alleging the sale by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on November 20, 1913, at the District aforesaid, of a quantity of so-called butter which was adulterated, in that another substance, namely, oleomargarine, had been substituted for butter in whole and in part. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the product was an imitation of butter and was offered for sale and was sold under the distinctive name of another article of food.

On January 2, 1914, the defendant entered a plea of guilty, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1914.*

3262. Adulteration and misbranding of butter. U. S. v. William Assimack and George Lambros. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 211-c.)

On December 30, 1913, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Health Officer of said District, authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against William Assimack and George Lambros, Washington, D. C., alleging the sale by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on November 13, 1913, at the District aforesaid, of a quantity of so-called butter which was adulterated and misbranded. Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that another substance, namely, oleomargarine, had been substituted for the butter in whole or in part. Misbranding was alleged for the reason that the product was an imitation of butter and was offered for sale and was sold under the distinctive name of another article of food.

On December 30, 1913, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on the above by the defendants, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1914.*

3263. Adulteration of milk. U. S. v. E. C. Williams. Plea of guilty. Fine, \$10. (F. & D. No. 212-c.)

On January 5, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Health Officer of said District, authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against E. C. Williams, Port Deposit, Md., alleging the shipment by said defendant, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on November 11 and 17, 1913, from the State of Maryland into the District of Columbia, of quantities of milk which was adulterated. Adulteration of the product was

alleged in the information for the reason that a certain substance, to wit, water, had been mixed and packed with said food so as to reduce and lower and injuriously affect its quality and strength.

On January 5, 1914, the defendant entered a plea of guilty to the information, and the court imposed a fine of \$10.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 8, 1914.

3264. Adulteration of milk. U. S. v. John Foscato and Victor Facchina.
Plea of guilty. Fine, \$20. (F. & D. No. 213-c.)

On January 10, 1914, the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, acting upon a report by the Health Officer of said District, authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the Police Court of the District aforesaid an information against John Foscato and Victor Facchina, Franconia, Va., alleging the shipment by said defendants, in violation of the Food and Drugs Act, on December 17 and 18, 1913, from the State of Virginia into the District of Columbia, of quantities of certain articles of food which were adulterated. Adulteration of the product was alleged in the information for the reason that it had been mixed and packed with a substance, to wit, water, which reduced and lowered its quality and strength.

On January 10, 1914, a plea of guilty to the information was entered on the above by the defendants, and the court imposed a fine of \$20.

B. T. GALLOWAY, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 8, 1914.

3265. Adulteration and misbranding of cottonseed feed meal. U. S. v. 500 Sacks of Cottonseed Feed Meal. Product released on bond. (F. & D. No. 214-c.)

On January 2, 1914, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Alabama, acting upon a report by the Commissioner of Agriculture and Industries of the State of Alabama, authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 500 sacks, each containing 100 pounds of cottonseed feed meal, remaining unsold in the original unbroken packages and in possession of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co. at Montgomery, Ala., alleging that the product had been shipped on December 6, 1913, by the Memphis Manufacturing Co., Memphis, Tenn., and transported from the State of Tennessee into the State of Alabama, and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The product was labeled: "100 Pounds Imperial Brand Cotton Seed Feed Meal for Stock Feed only Manufactured by Memphis Manufacturing Co., Memphis, Tenn. Mixture of Cotton Seed Meal and Hull Bran Guaranteed Analysis: Protein, 22%; Fat, .05% [5% (?)]; Fibre, 22%; Carbohydrates, 38%."

Misbranding of the product was alleged in the libel for the reason that it did not contain protein, 22 per cent; fat, .05 per cent [5 per cent (?)]; fiber, 22 per cent, but contained, to wit, only 19.69 per cent protein, 4.23 per cent fat, and 27.70 per cent fiber. It was further alleged in the libel that the product was adulterated and misbranded for the reason that it was largely deficient in the principal and valuable ingredients of animal food, in that it contained a smaller percentage of protein than it was branded to contain; that it contained a smaller percentage of fat than it was branded to contain, which two constituents of animal food are material and valuable, and that said cottonseed feed meal contained a larger percentage of fiber than it was branded to contain, which said constituent of animal food is not a valuable constituent of